

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 09/431,451 | Applicant(s) SENAPATHY, PERIANNAN | |
| | Examiner Bradley L. Sisson | Art Unit 1634 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: Finally rejected

 (1) Bradley L. Sisson, Primary Examiner.

(3) _____.

 (2) Joseph T. Leone, Reg. No. 37,170.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 June 2002
Time: 2:50 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 103(a)

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

US 6,521,428 B1 Senapathy (18 February 2003); US 6,528,288 B2 Senapathy (04 March 2003), US 5,807,679 Kamb (15 September 1998)


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Sisson indicated agreement with Mr. Leone as to the request for withdrawal of finality.

Mr. Sisson indicated that issues of obviousness-type double patenting (ODP) exist with respect to two US patents issues this year to applicant, and that prior-art issues may exist with respect to the Kamb patent. Mr. Sisson directed attention to column 6 of Kamb. With respect to the ODP issues, Mr. Sisson indicated that the current claims are broader than that recited in the patents. Mr. Sisson also noted that claims 25-29 of the '428 patent are drawn to a method of amplifying a nucleic acid.

Mr. Leone indicated that he would review the files for both of the Senapathy patents with the thought of preparing a Terminal Disclaimer. Mr. Leone indicated that he would also review the file of the '428 patent for argument relative to the Kamb patent..